

**Karner Blue HCP
HCP Monitoring Improvement Team (MIT)
March 1, 2005
9:30 a.m. – 2:30 p.m.
Sandhill WA - Babcock
MINUTES**

Attendees: Dave Lentz (facilitator), Jaime Thibodeaux (recorder), Bob Hess, Tim Wilder, Cathy Carnes, Matt Krumenauer, Paul Rasmussen, Joel Aanensen, Scott Swengel.

Absent: Rich King, Paul Kooiker

1. Anti-trust statement –Dave gave the statement

2. Review Agenda –

Discussed comments from the winter HCP meeting and IOC meeting. (Paula K's comment and Jim Z's comment).

1. Review January MIT meeting (minutes attached) **and action items.**

1. Dave talked to people at ER about protecting partner data. This will be no problem for them to protect it through NHI. Cathy would like to know if there is a conflict with data entry and management using federal funds. **Jimmy talk to Tony Sullins (FWS attorney).**
2. Jaime did a research on encroachment of shrubs and handed out a summary. She found mostly data on historical disturbance. Could we assume historical trends are best for KBB? **Look at report by Cathy Kirk regarding land management practices on Jackson County Forest to see what impacts were on KBBs and their habitats. Jaime will dig this up.**
3. **Jaime set-up site pool (not done).**
4. **Dave will ask Paula Kleintjes about nectar plant needs for KBB. Scott gave us nectar plant articles. Dave and Jaime will also study those articles.**

4. "Monitoring Planning Chart" homework for management activities in category 2 level of uncertainty.

- **Review and complete charts** (Scott asked to the need to look at possibly reinstating level 3 studies for trend monitoring.)
There is a need to re-establish level 3 data on POH and feature and enhance sites for trends monitoring. Scott feels that the set-up for our monitoring in '98 was a great measure of No Net Loss of Habitat. This data is robust against our changing goals. The pre and post management monitoring was another great idea to study if our protocols were appropriate. Today we are still conducting pre and post management surveys, but are no longer collecting them and have stopped effectiveness/trends monitoring. Dave feels that the DNR has no money to pay for monitoring. The effectiveness/trends monitoring was not good for analyzing our specific management activities. However, today there is a need for this information again. We can look into doing level 3 surveys on POH (managing to feature) and recovery properties (15 sites) with a good portion of our sites remaining the same. This will tell us how well Karners are doing over-all. The MIT will begin to discuss this issue further in future meetings.

5. "Adaptive Management Studies" Candidate Site Questionnaire

- **Discuss issues from HCP Team meeting**

Jim Zahasky suggested that we define how the mechanical site prep is defined. Joel and Bob feel equipment will be easier to relate to. We could also add the percentages of surface disturbance.

10% or less = light (Bracke scarifier, light intensity roller chopper)

25-60% =medium (disc trencher, roller chopper, v-plow)

>60% =heavy (brush disking, high intensity roller chopper)

- **Site activity questionnaire comments**

- How did we come-up with 20 sites? This is based on a number generated by Paul Rasmussen (our stats consultant). How many sites should partners submit?
- Could we just keep tabs on all the pre- and post management surveys? Could we have them just keep track of all the surveys done on one piece of property (an inventory sheet)?
- We could start to capture pre and post surveys with management activities on annual reports.
- Pre and post management surveys are sometimes the same thing (for Plum Creek at least).
- Should we ask people to just go back at least 5 growing seasons for post –management surveys if they haven't done them already? There must be a limit on when we do our post-management surveys. This could be a huge work-load increase. For the future? Could we set a limit for 5 years (that should be a time for a regeneration survey for their forestry activities)
- We may need to ask for post-management expected dates. This could help us make our site selections.
- Do we need to survey the site several times post –management (do we have to go back 5 years in a row)? This depends on what our objective would be. Should only probably have to do a survey once. We could ask them to follow standard level 2 surveys.
- How far back do we go for activities? – can go as far back as possible and especially if you have a post-management survey.
- We definitely need more than 20 sites to choose from for each activity so that we can pick from several.

Review of Break out A from HCP meeting (ROW):

Partners decided we don't need to study the rotation time as it relates to KBB. Partners have been managing and setting rotation times for business reasons, such as access to ROW. We can assume that their management rotations are coincidentally beneficial for KBBs when guided by their business management objectives. Pre and post management will tell us if this is or is not working.

Review of Break-out B from HCP meeting (SM):

To prove shifting mosaic works, we can't look at a specific property, but we also can't look everywhere. Joel showed the MIT an example of what Plum Creek has done with their Karner information on a landscape scale. At the HCP meeting we thought of looking at a specific county for an example of SM across property boundaries. Jackson and Clark counties

were suggested counties to use. We could also obtain information from POH, ROW, and small private lands folks to demonstrate SM works. Not all counties have a patchwork of managed lands like these counties. However, we are simply trying to demonstrate that the concept works. This is one of the questions on the audit form that partners have to demonstrate. We may begin this project by collecting partner shapefiles and adding them together to one database.

At the HCP meeting we also concluded that the biggest data gaps are the post-management surveys. This county-level study needs to be done through several years to add time to the dimension. There may be enough information collected already to look back over time (if the post management surveys have been done).

Jaime will call Jackson and Clark counties (Jim Zahaski, Rick Dailey, Joel Aanensen, Black River State Forest –Jack Halbreter, ROW partners, and Mike Engel) and ask for willingness to participate in this project.

Cathy will follow-up on a student from U of M studying GIS and endangered species project. Need to make sure that they have a result within a reasonable amount of time.

We could begin to do this after we get a data manager as well as some funding. We may start to have discussions on this for the summer. Are partners willing to do this? We need to wait until Jackson county gets their superintendent.

Conclusion: we will begin this after we get the site questionnaire study done.

- **Revisit the question, “What do we need to learn from the 2005 Site Questionnaire?”**

We went over the hand-out created by the data manager (Jaime -see attached). This summarizes the goals and expectations of the 2004 site activities questionnaire.

We looked over the specific management activities from the site activities questionnaire. Several people thought the activity referring to Invasive Plant Control was too great and varied of an activity. There seemed to be no focus of this activity. Matt Krumenauer also stated that “partners are not responsible for controlling invasive species”. The MIT knows that invasives are problematic for Karner habitat; however there are several methods of controlling them. This site questionnaire is too broad of a subject for this questionnaire and should be directed more towards a research study. Therefore we will take this off of our activities list.

If we are finding the other site activities are opening up the habitat for invasives, then will partners be required to change their management objectives? This is adaptive management. However, there is a difference between managing with consideration vs. managing primarily for Karners. This has become a problem in our discussions. Some partners feel as though the invasives questions on monitoring forms may suggest they need to conduct invasives work. This work is done primarily through the partners voluntarily and is not required.

- **Review revised questionnaire for 2005**

There is a conclusion that this year's questionnaire will only contain forestry activities and we will be limiting the number of surveys the partners need to submit.

Additionally, the post-management surveys will look more at the vegetation response to management activities rather than simply Karner presence or absence.

The site prep activities will be described using equipment and percentage of disturbance rather than its current description.

Jaime will revise site questionnaire and submit to Matt, Joel, and Bob for review before distribution. She will then distribute to partners and communicate with them regarding the number of sites to submit.

6. Shifting Mosaic – How to demonstrate SM works

- **What did we learn at the HCP meeting SM breakout?**
- **Discuss issue and develop goals and objectives for monitoring and management.**

⇒ See review of HCP meeting above.

7. Closing (15 min.)

- **Summarize action items & assignments.**

Who?	Action	Due
Jimmy	1. Talk to Tony Sullins about NHI data protection	Next MIT
Jaime	2. Look at Cathy Kirk's report on succession of habitat	Next MIT
Jaime	3. set-up site pool	
Dave	4. Ask Paula K. about nectar plants and KBBs	Next MIT
Jaime	5. Begin to make calls to SM counties for an example study	Next MIT
Cathy	6. Follow-up with a UM student to see if they are interested in leading the SM study for their research project	Next MIT
Jaime	7. Revise site questionnaire and send to Bob, Matt, and Joel	ASAP!

- **Next Steps?**

Begin to think about survey forms for the activities of interest, trends monitoring, and a SM study on the county level.

- A future meeting was not scheduled. We will move forward into the monitoring season and schedule a meeting mid-summer.